

Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 64 FR 35590, 35625 (July 1, 1999). In this case, those conditions have been met.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2), the Department may request that a respondent submit factual information at any time during a proceeding. Because the Department requested that Rubberflex submit the documentation in question, it is not untimely within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.301.

We find that the documentation provided by Rubberflex provides clear evidence that the sales at issue had been reported in error. Contrary to the petitioner's assertions, the Department does not require respondents to demonstrate that factual errors in their data are apparent in the record of a proceeding. The effect of such a requirement would be to preclude respondents, as is the case here, from notifying the Department of any clerical errors found in their data. *See NTN Bearing Corp. v. U.S.*, 74 F.3d 1204, 1207-08 (1995). Consequently, because Rubberflex provided sufficient proof that the sales in question were not home market transactions, we have disregarded them for purposes of the final results.

Comment 4: Calculation of U.S. Indirect Selling Expenses

The petitioner argues that Rubberflex understated the indirect selling expenses of its U.S. subsidiary, Flexfil, because it allocated a certain portion of these expenses to Canadian sales which were not invoiced by Flexfil. The petitioner contends that, if Flexfil had had significant involvement in the sales, they would have appeared on Flexfil's books. Furthermore, the petitioner asserts that such "off the books" allocations are inherently unverifiable and arbitrary. According to the petitioner, the Department should reallocate these expenses using only the sales made by the subsidiary and recorded in the subsidiary's books.

DOC Position

In its supplemental questionnaire response, Rubberflex demonstrated that Flexfil was actively involved in making sales to Canada. (*See* pages 15 and 16, as well as Exhibit 32, of the September 7, 1999, submission.) Not only did Flexfil routinely accept orders from Canadian customers on behalf of Rubberflex, but it also corresponded with them regarding the status of these

orders and it handled various problems which arose during the sales process.

Thus, because the indirect selling expenses incurred by Flexfil related, in part, to sales to Canada, we find that it is appropriate to allocate a portion of these expenses to Canadian sales. We note that this treatment of Flexfil's indirect selling expenses is in accordance with our treatment of such expenses in prior segments of this proceeding. *See, e.g., Thread Fifth Review*, 64 FR at 12976, where the Department verified Flexfil's role in making Canadian sales. Accordingly, we have accepted Flexfil's indirect selling expense allocation for purposes of the final results.

Final Results of Review

As a result of comments received we have revised our analysis and determine that the following margins exist for the period October 1, 1997, through September 30, 1998:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Percent margin
Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd	0.45
Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./
Filmax Sdn. Bhd	0.17
Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd	1.10
Rubfil Sdn. Bhd	52.89

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated importer-specific assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those sales. These rates will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates for those firms as stated above (except for Filati and Heveafil the cash deposit rates will be zero because their margins are *de minimis*); (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the

most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.16 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), section 777(i) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677f(i)), and 19 CFR 351.210(c).

Dated: January 31, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-2845 Filed 2-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-475-703, A-588-707]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders: Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy and Japan

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Continuation of Antidumping Orders: Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy and Japan.

SUMMARY: On December 3, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the

Department”), pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), determined that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin (“PTFE”) from Italy and Japan would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping (64 FR 67865 (December 3, 1999)). On December 27, 1999, the International Trade Commission (“the Commission”), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on PTFE from Italy and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (64 FR 72362 (December 27, 1999)). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department is publishing this notice of the continuation of the antidumping duty orders on PTFE from Italy and Japan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 3, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Darla D. Brown or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

Background

On May 3, 1999, the Department initiated, and the Commission instituted, sunset reviews (64 FR 23596 and 64 FR 23677, respectively) of the antidumping duty orders on PTFE from Italy and Japan pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of these reviews, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the orders revoked.¹

On December 27, 1999, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on PTFE from Italy and Japan would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.²

¹ See *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy and Japan*, 64 FR 67865 (December 3, 1999).

² See *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy and Japan*, 64 FR 72362 (December 27, 1999), and USITC Publication 3260 (December 1999), *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy and Japan: Investigations Nos. 731-TA-385-386 (Review)*.

Scope

The merchandise subject to these antidumping duty orders is PTFE from Italy and Japan. The subject merchandise is defined as granular PTFE resin, filled or unfilled. The order explicitly excludes PTFE dispersions in water and PTFE fine powders. Such merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 3904.61.00. This HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

There has been one scope ruling with respect to the order on PTFE from Japan in which reprocessed PTFE powder was determined to be outside the scope of the order (57 FR 57420; December 4, 1992). The Department issued a circumvention determination in which it determined that PTFE wet raw polymer exported from Italy to the United States falls within the scope of the order on PTFE from Italy (58 FR 26100; April 30, 1993).

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty orders on PTFE from Italy and Japan. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping duty deposits at the rate in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise.

Normally, the effective date of continuation of a finding, order, or suspension agreement will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Notice of Continuation. As provided in 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department will issue its determination to continue a finding, order, or suspended investigation not later than seven days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission’s determination concluding the sunset review and immediately thereafter will publish its notice of continuation in the **Federal Register**. In these instant cases, however, the Department’s publication of the Notice of Continuation was delayed. The Department has explicitly indicated that the effective date of continuation of these orders is January 3, 2000, seven days after the publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission’s determination. As a

result, pursuant to section 751(c)(6)(A) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than December 2004.

Dated: February 1, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–2837 Filed 2–7–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–412–803]

Industrial Nitrocellulose From the United Kingdom; Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On August 6, 1999, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose (“INC”) from the United Kingdom. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the section *Final Results of the Review*.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 8, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Trentham or Thomas Futtner, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office IV, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6320 or 482–3814, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”) by the Uruguay Round